Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*
Editorial Office 1323 M STREET, WASHINGTON 5, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066
VOL. V, NO. 19, *Issue Number* 224, MAY 12, 1948 ★ *Editors:* FELIX MORLEY & FRANK C. HANIGHEN

MAY 17 1948

A TANGLED WEB

by Felix Morley

It is no longer possible to conceal the complete failure of the United Nations as an instrumentality for the preservation of world peace. Nor is anything to be gained by pretending that UN, under its present Charter, will somehow be miraculously restored to health.

During the past few days there have been three separate admissions of the organization's futility. Foremost in the public eye is the Palestine debacle. In this troubled area the chief contribution of the United Nations has been to make a bad situation very much worse. Local difficulties have been inflamed to the point where they threaten world peace as a direct result of the various commissions, special assemblies and recommendations on the subject of Palestine. Here, instead of eliminating a threat to peace, UN has created one.

But Palestine is only one illustration of incompetency. For over two years there has been a United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, charged with establishing some effective international control over a weapon potentially capable of swiftly removing all mankind from this troubled planet. Last week seven governments, including those of the United States, Great Britain and France, formally requested that this work be abandoned. No agreement has been reached, and none is likely.

There is a related debacle in the once much-advertised responsibility of the United Nations to form an international "security force". An entire chapter (No. VII) of the United Nations Charter is devoted to grandiose provisions on this subject. Responsibility for translating this rhetoric into action is in the hands of various UN commissions. There is still effort to keep the complete failure here from public attention. But the fact is that UN is no longer even attempting to fulfill its solemn obligations in this field.

Congress has now passed legislation authorizing expenditure of more than three billion dollars to give this country a literally overwhelming Air Force. Yet while this armament race proceeds one may read, in Article 45 of the United Nations Charter, that:

> "In order to enable the United Nations to take urgent military measures, Members shall hold immediately available national air-force contingents for combined international enforcement action."

Copyright 1948 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The two most powerful Members of the United Nations are now taking "urgent military measures", not in concert but against each other. Meantime they still proclaim themselves "peace-loving nations". So it is written in the Charter of the misnamed United Nations.

II

Men do not prosper when they base their lives on dishonesty and deceit. The same, in the long run, applies to the policies of governments. For a people possessing a sense of honor, the policy of membership in the United Nations is no longer a source of satisfaction. It is, rather, a continuous headache which will in time become intolerable. The developing issue is no longer whether, but when and how.

The corpse of the albatross around our neck is there, as with the Ancient Mariner, because of our sins. The basic dishonesty of the United Nations Charter is written in its Preamble. This asserts that:

> "We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war . . . to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights . . . to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another . . . have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these ends."

This was a gross deception. The United Nations is not, and was never planned to be, an association of peoples. There is no such thing as citizenship in the United Nations, and there is not even a UN passport to enable a national of one Member-State to travel in the territory of another. The organization is nothing but an association of governments, and as such very inferior to the old League of Nations. Whether or not the Member governments represent their people is not even a criterion of membership, as Stalin knows very well.

Because it veiled essential deceit with fine phrases, and placed a mask of spurious idealism over its sinister purpose the United Nations for a time enjoyed a large measure of popular support. But people everywhere have now learned that the United Nations is essentially nothing more than an alliance of Great Powers, designed to run the world according to the wishes of their governments. The Government of Switzerland pointed this out when it refused to join UN, a significant action which has received singularly little publicity.

So long as the victors agreed in distribution of the loot of war, the essential rottenness of the UN Charter could be concealed. But when the victors began to quarrel with each other, collapse of the organization, which assumed their unity, became inevitable. That collapse cannot now be remedied.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One may be certain of this not only from the abundant surface evidence but also because the unescapable factor of moral retribution is clearly involved. History records no assumption more shameless than the UN pretense that the Communist tyranny in Moscow speaks for the oppressed people of Russia, and that it is the purpose of this tyranny "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights". An international organization based on such dishonesty was bound to fail.

III

Reform of the United Nations is now being urged in Congress. A number of Resolutions to this end have been introduced and the subject has reached the stage where hearings are being held before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

This has put our Department of State, under Secretary Marshall's well-meaning administration, in a tight corner. Nobody appreciates the present futility of the United Nations better than General Marshall and his principal aides. For months they have been working to establish alternative policies, such as the Truman Doctrine and the so-called Marshall Plan. But for two very good reasons the Department of State cannot publicly admit that it has abandoned hope for UN.

The first of these reasons is that this same department, when headed by the amiable but scarcely prescient Cordell Hull, was primarily responsible for constructing the United Nations in its grotesque form. Almost three years ago -- on July 4, 1945 -- HUMAN EVENTS described the Charter as a "Constitutional Monstrosity", and time has certainly proved the accuracy of this diagnosis. This monstrosity, unfortunately, was largely the product of the properly forgotten men who were assigned to the drafting job at Dumbarton Oaks by Secretary Hull. How can Secretary Marshall admit this -- in an election year? It is much easier to blame the wily Soviet, forgetting that Stalin did nothing more than accept "for keeps" the advantages which our "experts" handed him.

The second reason for Secretary Marshall's present embarrassment is his realization that nothing can be done to revise the UN Charter if the Kremlin does not want it revised. And since the Charter is already perfect -- from the viewpoint of those who want to keep the United Nations from accomplishing anything -- there is no reason to suppose that Russia will permit revision. It is much more effective for Molotov, Vishinsky, Gromyko et al., to declare from New York that the State Department is working to destroy UN. That is an exaggeration, but contains enough truth to have a sting.

Russia will not resign from UN because it only joined in order to obstruct. And Russia cannot be expelled because as a permanent member

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Security Council it can always veto any move to that end. Our own Department of State is responsible for the brilliant wording of Article 6 of the Charter, which reads, with emphasis supplied:

> "A Member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the Principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the Organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

IV

However, it is possible, temporarily, for the Truman administration to maintain that it is supporting the Charter of the United Nations, while actually working to destroy it.

This oblique policy, which we are currently following, is possible because the Charter gives indorsement to "regional agreements" and, by closing one's eyes, an anti-Soviet alliance of Western Europe can be called such a "regional agreement". It is necessary to forget, however, that this Western European Union is backed by the United States primarily because it is directed against our former Ally and co-member on the "Security Council" of UN. The Soviet Government is justified in accusing us, as we accuse it, of "interference in the internal affairs of other States".

The firm position taken by the Soviet Union is forcing us to a realistic examination of our foreign policy. The pretense that it is still based on the Charter of the United Nations will have to be abandoned. But that should make the frank discussions with the Kremlin, now foreshadowed, less rather than more difficult.

Students of history will recall the course followed by Great Britain in regard to the Quadruple Alliance, the prototye of UN, established to hold France down after the Napoleonic wars. That reactionary grouping survived for eight uneasy years, and collapsed when Great Britain realized that the policy of intervention was ruinous to all of Britain's primary interests. There is a timely ring to the famous letter of instruction which Canning sent to the British Ambassador at Vienna in 1823; dissolving the UN of that day:

> "England is under no obligation to interfere, or to assist in interfering, in the internal concerns of independent nations. . . . Our influence, if it is to be maintained abroad, must be secure in the sources of strength at home; and the sources of that strength are in the sympathy between the people and the Government; in the union of the public sentiment with the public counsels."

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1323 M Street, N. W., Washington 5, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) and foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events VOL. V, NO. 19

By Frank C. Hanighen May 12, 1948

In the past two weeks, a new name -- or rather an old name revived -- has been mentioned frequently in the conversations of the politicians burdened with the problem of finding a Presidential candidate for the GOP. The name is that of Senator John W. Bricker of Ohio; the talk of Bricker has arisen purely from the anxious search for the ideal "compromise candidate". It has certainly not come from friends of Bricker, nor with the slightest encouragement of the Senator. He remains loyal to his colleague Taft.

There are a number of reasons why Bricker is being considered, in case the Convention is deadlocked. Bricker bowed out of the race in favor of Governor Dewey in Chicago in 1944. Presumably Dewey might be inclined to return the compliment. Likewise, if Senator Taft faces the necessity of turning loose his supporters at the Convention, he would probably prefer his colleague from Ohio to Dewey or Vandenberg or Joe Martin. Indeed, many of the delegates now supposed to be for Taft or Dewey were delegates in 1944 and were for Bricker in that year.

Some of this talk arises from the excellent showing made by Bricker in the Ohio primary. In his race for delegate, Bricker led the entire slate, polling 424,171 votes. Facts like that lead politicos to ruminate on other assets of the junior Senator from Ohio. He is photogenic and possesses a "personality appeal" which both Dewey and Taft lack. He is a good speaker. He is regarded by Republican regulars as "sound", his voting record in the Senate as impeccable. He has many friends throughout the country, among them delegates who believe that he should have received the nomination in 1944.

* * * * *

A cloud no bigger than a Senator's hand has appeared on the hitherto bright horizon of Vandenberg, another "compromise candidate". On May 4, as President of the Senate, the Michigan Senator had to make a ruling as to which committee, Finance or Agriculture, should have jurisdiction on the controversial oleomargarine bill. He directed that it should be Agriculture, but the following day was overruled by a majority vote of the Senate, which sent the bill to Finance. Supporters of the bill to repeal taxes on margarine felt that it would receive favorable action in Finance, but that Agriculture would pigeonhole it.

Vandenberg probably reached his decision quite sincerely and correctly. Nevertheless, the ruling was immediately criticized as "political". "Van thinks", said one denizen of the Hill, "that he has the city voters in his pocket already -- hence he sought the support of the dairy farmers". In any case, the Michigan Senator had to make a choice on an important domestic issue. If he is really a candidate, as many think, then the decision must have been painful. For much of Vandenberg's strength in this Presidential year is due to the fact that he has not had to make choices on domestic issues, has not incurred the political liabilities which hamper the progress of other Presidential aspirants.

* * * * *

Last week this column gave the ECA administration, if not an entirely clean bill, at least a favorable health chart. But in the past few days criticism has modified the optimistic picture. For one thing, we have seen a list of about 25 persons, hired for low-echelon jobs of ECA, whose records are pungently reminiscent of similar rolls of OPA, UNRRA, etc. Membership in Communist front organizations and other disturbing items mark these records.

There are also criticisms as to policy. Economic experts insist that ECA should send steel experts to Germany to raise production to at least one million

Copyright 1948 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tons a month (at present 300,000); that would save the six million tons of steel from the overloaded American production, which is at present allotted to Europe. Also, instead of exporting scarce agricultural machinery, why does not ECA depend on German manufacture of these implements? Finally, an exchange control should be instituted so that the 16 recipients will receive the utmost value from ECA dollars. From these criticisms, it is apparent that Mr. Charles Dewey, new head of the Senate "watchdog" committee has his work cut out for him.

* * * * *

The Report (accompanying H. R. 5852) of the House Committee on Un-American Activities scarcely supports the scandalously-propagated legend that the Committee is a sort of combination of a Star Chamber and the GPU. The Report explains and recommends legislation for controlling Communist activities in the United States. The principal recommendation is for registration not only of Communist organizations but also of Communist fronts. One frequent -- and largely insincere -- criticism of the Committee has been that it never climaxes its investigational endeavors with legislation. Now the critics are presented with a proposal for legislation. Naturally, many of them do not fancy the prescription and fall upon it with the usual epithets of "reactionary" and "Fascist".

Chairman Thomas and his colleagues have been portrayed as "bloated capitalist lackeys", and worse. If they are, then the section of their report entitled "Analysis of the Problem" must have been written for them by someone like Norman Thomas. The recommendations reflect an earnest effort to conform with the Constitutional guarantees; their effectiveness may or may not prove adequate. But the spirit of the Committee's approach to the problem suggests that the proposal has been framed with great caution. "How to protect freedom", says the Report, "from those who would destroy it without infringing upon the freedom of all our people presents a question fraught with Constitutional and practical difficulties. We must not mortally wound our democratic framework in attempting to protect it from those who threaten to destroy it. . . . In considering the problem, the Committee found it necessary at the outset to distinguish those features of Communist activity against which legislation cannot and should not be directed, from those in the case of which legislative restraints are clearly practicable and necessary. Communism as an economic, social and political theory is one thing. Communism as a secret conspiracy, dedicated to subverting the interests of the United States to that of a foreign dictatorship, is another.

"The Committee holds no brief for the economic, social and political theories which the Communists advocate, but we contend that, under our Constitutional system, ideas must be combatted with ideas and not with legislation. If Communism in the United States operated in the open, without foreign direction, and without attempting to set up a dictatorship subservient to a foreign Power, legislation directed against them would neither be justified nor necessary."

* * * * *

The Russian "peace" maneuver has obviously backfired in the United States, but its effects in Europe remain to be seen. Certainly Tuesday, May 11, was a day of great confusion for any reporter attempting to obtain a clarification of the episode from those who are supposed to know the facts about U. S. foreign policy. One maddening moment in our hectic life on that day was when State Department spokesmen declined to admit that the Russian publication of the Bedell Smith-Molotov exchange was a breach of confidence. Russia, indeed, won a trick in the psychological warfare.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the basis of available evidence, it is not believed that State was attempting any real appeasement. But officials here fear that State Department bungling may be interpreted in the democratic world as more than the normal Washington stupidity. Late in April, M. Bertrand de Jouvenel in Paris wrote us inquiring as to a rumor, then afloat in European capitals, that Washington was sending an appeasement mission to Moscow. M. de Jouvenel commented: "In three days this rumor has undone not only the moral effect of the Italian elections but all the political gains of a year's efforts." Apparently, the Moscow propaganda machine was starting a whispering campaign as a preliminary for its trick of yesterday.

* * * * *

Behind the scenes in Washington, political leaders are studying an American program to rearm Western European nations. On April 28 the Washington Evening Star reported that Secretary of State Marshall, Undersecretary of State Lovett, Vandenberg and John Foster Dulles went into a huddle to discuss such a program. Other newspaper articles suggested that Congress might be asked to appropriate several hundred millions to underwrite such a program. Meanwhile, secret military staff talks, of which rearmament was the most important topic, were taking place in London between nations of the new Western union. Diplomatic observers in Washington interpreted Secretary Marshall's statement to Congress of May 5 as, among other things, an attempt to provide a legal means for giving such arms help. Marshall opposed revision of the UN Charter, and the most significant passage of his statement was seen to be that dealing with UN regional defense measures. The Secretary and Senator Vandenberg reportedly believe that the most feasible method of providing arms would be under a UN regional defense arrangement.

Whatever the method, the sum of $300,000,000 is deemed absurdly low. Competent military quarters explain the situation as follows: Any force capable of stemming aggression in Europe must be estimated at 80 divisions. New and improved arms would have to be provided not only for the equipment of this number of divisions, but also for replacements. In other words, production sights would have to be set at arms for 160 divisions, and U. S. plants would have to bear the major burden. Instead of a few hundred million, the expenditure of many billions of dollars would have to be envisaged. Naturally, no political leader has the hardihood to publicly reveal the actual magnitude of the task of "arming Western Europe".

* * * * *

The Russian role in the Palestine drama is rarely mentioned by commentators these days, but it is nevertheless causing increasing concern in Government circles. This column's story last week about Russian-trained Jewish contingents waiting in Balkan ports for the crucial May 15 has elicited murmurs of confirmation from official quarters. This week, we have received a picture of Russian penetration in Palestine, which checks with some Governmental information. It is from a former Polish business man, resident in Palestine for the past two years, who has recently arrived in the United States. The gist of his remarks is as follows:

Irgun, the Leftish terrorist organization, is infiltrated by the Communists. But the real Red fifth column is the Stern gang, and the consulates of the Polish Communist Government. The Stern gang is 100 per cent Communist and includes regular Russian MVD agents. Guards of the Polish consulates are entirely composed of Stern gang members. There are five of these consulates, all generously staffed -- with from 100 to 150 members. They give the Stern gang ample diplomatic protection and provide media for spreading Russian propaganda throughout the country, as well as for obtaining the necessary intelligence for the Soviet Union.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Events

President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War: 1941. A Study in Appearances and Realities, by Charles Beard. New Haven: Yale University Press, $5.00. Reviewed by John Chamberlain.

It is an old story that pretenses, promises and realities in politics seldom jibe: few people are unduly surprised when a newly-elected President blandly proceeds to junk the more solemn planks of his campaign platform, and only babes-in-arms are horrified to discover that the latest "surge from the grass roots" is, in crude fact, a mere ripple from a smoke-filled room. Even so, there are degrees in duplicity, and the most case-hardened Missouri mule might be surprised at the record which "Uncle Charlie" Beard, the dean of American historians, has unfolded in his President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War: 1941.

The schematization of the Beard document is almost brutally simple. Part I is devoted to the "appearances" of the fatal pre-Pearl Harbor year. Part II is called "Unveiling Realities". Then comes the real meat of the book, a section called "Realities as Described by the Pearl Harbor Documents". It was an "appearance" at the beginning of 1941 that Roosevelt carried a moral responsibility for his covenant with the voters to keep the U. S. out of war. Lend-lease, which came early in the year, was a "peace" measure; we were "patrolling" the sea lanes of the Atlantic to "keep war from our shores"; the Atlantic Conference was merely a friendly visit between two statesmen. But the "reality" of 1941, according to Beard, was that President Roosevelt had already firmly resolved to put us formally into the war as soon as he could bring the "escape clause" of his 1940 platform into operation -- the clause that would permit him to fight "in case of attack".

It was another "reality" of 1941, according to the record quoted by Beard, that we began fighting on an "informal" basis when our Atlantic Navy started firing on Nazi submarines. Still another "reality" was the refusal to meet with Konoye, the "last of the Japanese liberals", in an attempt to explore the possibilities of bringing peace to the Pacific. But the most astounding "reality" of all was the account of a November, 1941, meeting of the War Cabinet which Stimson confided to his diary. "The question facing the Cabinet", wrote Stimson, "was how we should maneuver them [the Japanese] into the position of firing the first shot without allowing too much danger to ourselves. It was a difficult proposition."

No doubt Roosevelt was still of two minds about fighting the Japanese up to the very day of Pearl Harbor: ambivalence is a fact of human psychology that affects men in high places as well as in low. Nevertheless, the truth remains that the Roosevelt government did not give the peoples' representatives in Congress a chance to pass on any of the real issues of 1941. For the sake of argument let us admit that Roosevelt was right about the need to go all the way into war if the Nazi threat were to be beaten back. Let us admit that he knew better than the people of the United States; that he and Stimson and their followers had a monopoly of true patriotism. Even if all this were true, it still leaves one with a most uncomfortable feeling. For if the people and their representatives can't be trusted to make their own decisions, if an elite must do their analysis and make up their minds for them, what is one to make of all the winged words which Roosevelt spoke in 1932 about the virtues of his Forgotten Man? "Uncle Charlie" Beard does not for a moment admit the war was necessary. But, even if the need for our participation in active fighting is to be granted, the dilemma he poses remains: Under the Roosevelt theory of statecraft, the Republic must soon become a thing of the past.

John Chamberlain, for many years daily book reviewer for the New York Times, is now a Senior Writer on the staff of Life magazine.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED